HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 15 Saturday, April 9, 1955 1835 K St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

News Section

The Real Plot: The charge that there is a "war plot" to precipitate the U.S. into World War III holds no water — when analyzed by well-informed Senators and Washington scribes who know a good deal more than they dare submit to their internationalist editors.

The true picture is, on the contrary, something more like a "plot" by internationalists in and out of (but close to) the Administration, to take us another step into world government, by appeasing the China Reds in the Formosa Strait.

Significant fact in connection with the "war plot" charge was that it was launched by Senator Estes Kefauver (who was perhaps "chosen" by leaders of the "one-world" thinkers to launch it.) Kefauver sponsored a congressional resolution to consider Atlantic Union, a plan to give away U.S. sovereignty. It is an old tactic of "plotters" to accuse those impeding their *complot* of guilt themselves.

Actually, the anti-appeasers are officials, operating frankly and quite in the open: Admiral Radford, Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Secretary Dulles; Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson (his performance on television is well known); and Senator Knowland, GOP leader in the Senate, who bluntly speaks his views almost daily. Never has a "plot" been so openly conducted.

Heading the "liberal internationalist appeasers" — the anti-appeasers claim — is Dr. Milton Eisenhower, brother of the President. It is widely known in the Capital that he visits the White House (but unannounced) several times a week. Dr. Eisenhower, now President of Penn State College, is known to have been in favor of world government and internationalism for many years. There is much speculation among the anti-appeasers that Dr. Eisenhower is an "appeasement" influence on the President.

From sources on the spot, this column learns that Dr. Eisenhower takes a plane several times a week, on the average, from the town of State College, Pa., for Washington.

Whatever the personnel and organization of the "appeasement plot" (and anti-appeasers assert there is one), the outlines of its action in case of a crisis are a matter of private discussion in congressional cloakrooms and other gathering places. The prospects are: (1) a wavering White House attitude in case the China Reds strike; (2) concurrently proposals for a Big Four emergency conference; (3) sudden press emphasis on the danger of atomic attack on the continental U.S.; and (4) commitment of the U.S. Government to surrender of more of U.S. sovereignty in one form or another to an international consortium or world government. It could prove to be the biggest Munich, or Yalta, of our time.

Not Merely Gossip: The sum of $60 million for "military aid" for Yugoslavia — such, according to inside sources, is the request which Stassen's Foreign Operations Administration is readying for Congress after the Easter recess. It is believed that Stassen — buoyed by his new position as Secretary for Peace and Disarmament — hopes to bluff this proposal through the Appropriations Committees, despite the aversion of key members of Congress to Marshal Tito. It is not forgotten that the Dictator of Yugoslavia several months ago pledged to arm a brigade (out of the equipment which the U.S. has given him) to the Soviet puppet government of Burma.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● **Senator McCarthy is planning to put his name up as candidate for the GOP presidential nomination in a dozen states in 1956 — say friends. He will defer to "favorite sons" in some states; indeed he would defer nationally to Senator Knowland if the Californian should run for the nomination and would campaign for him.**

● Last week, the conservatives in the State Department won a victory, with the formal announcement of the appointment of Frances Knight to head the Division of Passport Control, to succeed Ruth Shipley, who for decades has fought left-wingers and maintained a high "security" standard. Miss Knight was Mrs. Shipley's choice for the position (see HUMAN EVENTS, March 12) and her appointment was bitterly fought by "liberals."

Labor Front: Last week, Montgomery Ward and Company signed a labor agreement with Dave Beck of the AFL Teamsters Union. This removes the threat of a strike before the annual stockholders meeting on April 22. And Dave Beck indicated that his union would vote its 13,500 shares of Ward Stock for the present management, headed by Mr. Sewell Avery. Thus Avery has gained a reinforcement in his fight to retain control of the company against the efforts of Louis E. Wolfson, owner of the Capital Transit Company, Washington, D. C., who seeks to oust the Avery control at the stockholders meeting.

Few observers here regard this development as anything but a Beck-Avery deal, despite protestations to the contrary. Thus, as HUMAN EVENTS pointed out in this section on February 5, a union acquiring stocks in a company, when it acts as an agent bargaining with the management of that company, thereby adopts a position of "bargaining with itself;" and now the union has quite apparently used the shares in a "proxy" battle situation and in a labor bargaining situation. All this was done with "welfare funds" of the union. Those who are concerned with "labor laws" see in the whole matter a development of something rather peculiar.

Representative Carroll Kearns (R., Pa.), member of the House Labor Committee, finds this situation "unusual" and thinks it should be brought to the attention of the subcommittee investigating union welfare funds.

● Ward has a long history of labor trouble; its largest competitor, Sears, has had little. Experts in the labor field point out that Sears never had any labor contracts, that union agents have failed to organize Sears' workers. They attribute this situation to the generous profit-sharing system in Sears, with employees owning a large percentage of Sears' stock.

● **Washington's guess is that Reuther may win a "guaranteed annual wage" decision from auto giants without a strike. The victory would be one of "principle," with little money involved. The companies would yield because of the stiff sales battle now under way.**

Government In Business: Most people know that, since 1933, the Federal government has been invading the field of private business. But there is little public comprehension of the extent to which it has been carried. The Hoover Commission has been looking into the extent of government in business and has been turning up startling examples of tax-exempt government enterprises competing unfairly with private business. From other sources equally startling facts are being brought to light. HUMAN EVENTS, therefore, plans each week for some time to focus attention on this dangerous situation which might be called "concealed socialism."

This week we report the case of the Panama Steamship Line, government-owned and operated. This line has a weekly service from New York to the Canal Zone. It leases a terminal in New York at a cost (in 1954) of $102,814, and uses the Panama Canal terminal at Cristobal in the same manner as commercial users. In 1954 (southbound) the line carried 3,743 commercial passengers and 93,338 tons of commercial freight. Northbound, it transported 3,123 passengers and 31,011 tons of commercial freight. We are told that while it costs around $160 to carry a passenger from New York to Panama, the Panama Steamship Line charges government employees only *forty dollars* one way.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1950, the line reported a loss of $37 and in 1953 a break-even operation. The U.S. Government Accounting Office severely criticized the line's 1953 report, stating that it had achieved its no-loss position by "transferring its net operating loss to other government businesses in the Canal Zone." In 1954 the line reported a loss of around $38,000, but because of the tricky bookkeeping of government enterprises in the Canal Zone the loss may have been larger.

Although the ships of the Panama Steamship Line are underloaded in their voyages, the line is actually in competition with another government steamship service — the Military Sea Transport Service, whose low rates also bid for commercial traffic to and from New York. The ships of MSTS, too, are underloaded.

Congress is at present faced with petitions for government assistance to the nation's merchant marine. Yet these two government lines operating out of Panama are costing the taxpayers money while they take business away from hard-pressed legitimate commercial lines who are being subsidized by the government because of lack of business. Of even greater importance to socialists is that these lines with their artificially low rates (made possible by their exemption from Federal taxes and from the necessity of earning any reasonable return on their investment to attract capital) are, like TVA, advertising the legend that government in business is more efficient than private enterprise.

Federal Aid To Education: The drive to commit Congress to a big appropriation for Federal aid to schools has received a severe setback. The reverse is all the more serious in that it comes from no less an advocate of education handouts than Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. Not long ago, Mrs. Hobby had testified that Federal aid to the states was necessary because some 407,000 classrooms (by 1960) were needed, she said, and could not be provided by local governments. Queried by critics, Mrs. Hobby reviewed her statistics and now says that only 176,000 classrooms by 1960 is the correct figure.

President Eisenhower has recommended a $7 billion school building program including Federal aid. Yet (see HUMAN EVENTS, News Section, March 5), the *New York Times* revealed passages from a secret report put together by the President's Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations, which says that not one state in the Union is financially unable to build and maintain its schools. The Commission will not render a public report until June.

The Indianapolis *Star*, commenting on Mrs. Hobby's somersault (March 31), remarks: "Mrs. Hobby says her first figures were based on the 'assumption' that only 50,000 schoolrooms a year were being built by the states. Now she says they find that 60,000 are being built. But does she know any better now than she did before how many schoolrooms the states will build between now and 1960? Let us 'assume' — for the fun of it, which seems to be the way Mrs. Hobby's helpers make their assumptions — that 90,000 a year will be built between now and 1960. Then even if we again 'assume' that Mrs. Hobby's newly conceived figures are correct, 'Quod Erat Demonstrandum'. The classroom shortage has vanished by 1960."

The Indiana paper noting the astonishing disappearance of so many classrooms "needed" as a result of correction of an error in Mrs. Hobby's department, says that this makes Hobby figures, present and future, on this subject "suspect." The *Star* concludes "that they are merely propaganda which attempts to stampede Congress into a dangerous experiment in Federal aid and its corollary, Federal control of American public education."

Billions And Baloney Lobby: Mr. Eugene Castle's book *Billions, Blunders and Baloney* (reviewed by HUMAN EVENTS, February 26) has so frightened the U.S. Information Agency (target of Castle's attacks on our propaganda abroad) that the bureaucrats are striking back. This fact is known to those who cover the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. These committees approve or kill requests for funds for the USIA; hence the concern of the bureaucrats.

Outside of Washington, few citizens realize that the most powerful lobby in the Capital is not the U.S. Steel or the big business associations; it is the Executive branch of the Government which, with far more funds at its disposal, is constantly working for its interests in the halls of Congress. In this

(See column 1, page 4)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

particular case, the USIA has a "war chest" which is listed in its annual appropriations as designed to "acquaint" Americans of its activities abroad and runs to about $200,000 a year. So, the USIA is toiling to refute various charges of Castle against itself. Those who get about the Hill have seen material of this nature distributed in Congress. It must represent quite a few man-hours and use of Government equipment (such as mimeographs) in order to acquaint people in this country about USIA activities. "Perhaps that is only fair"—is one comment; "the Executive lobby is supported by the taxpayer"—is another.

Grand Inquest: The Story of Congressional Investigations, by Telford Taylor. Simon and Schuster, Inc., 358 pp. Price, $4.50. Reviewed by C. Dickerman Williams.

Mr. Taylor graduated from the Harvard Law School with high standing in 1932. Soon after the inauguration of President Roosevelt in 1933, Mr. Taylor entered the New Deal, under the sponsorship of then Professor Frankfurter, whose militant article, "Hands Off the Investigations," published by the *New Republic* in 1924, had denounced in unsparing language those who sought to block Congressional investigations or to interfere with the procedural freedom of individual committees. Mr. Taylor held a succession of Government jobs; rather important jobs for so young a lawyer. That which he held longest and in which he first made his mark was as counsel to a Senate committee investigating railroad finance. He now practices law in New York, a partner of James M. Landis, whose article, "Constitutional Limitations on the Congressional Power of Investigation," published by the *Harvard Law Review* in 1926, remains to this day the most exhaustive and the most scholarly exposition of the theory of the substantially unlimited power of Congress to investigate. At Law School, Mr. Taylor says, he carefully studied these articles by Messrs. Frankfurter and Landis, and accepted their thinking.

It could hardly be expected that Mr. Taylor, presently a professional liberal and grownup New Dealer, would be objective about the Congressional investigations in the field of subversion, espionage and treason; but, considering Mr. Taylor's background, one might hope for intelligent criticism of them. In particular, one might hope that Mr. Taylor would tell us how, except as to subject-matter, the subversion investigations, which have so horrified the liberals, differ from the New Deal investigations, which so pleased them. Have the procedures changed adversely to witnesses? If exposure was so good then, why is it so bad now? And many similar questions have mystified detached observers. Unfortunately, Mr. Taylor gives no help on this score. He disposes of the investigations by the New Deal in a single sentence. He mentions only briefly the Teapot Dome investigations; highly publicized investigations of recent days, not relating to subversion, such as the R.F.C., Internal Revenue and Department of Justice investigations, are not referred to at all.

It can almost be said that Mr. Taylor's book consists of a rehash of the Alsop columns on Senator McCarthy and a collection of desultory information about Congressional investigation of the ancient past. Curiously enough, the point on which he goes after Senator McCarthy most severely is acceptance of information from federal employees out of channels. But such acceptance is explicitly authorized by the Act of August 24, 1912, now Section 652(d), Title 5 of the United States Code. And the Act of August 24, 1912 was adopted for the express purpose of invalidating Executive Order 1042, issued by President Taft on November 26, 1909 to forbid direct communication. Members of Congress, including Senator Watkins, repeatedly have sought or accepted direct information. Indeed, most investigations of the executive branch have been based on it. Mr. Taylor knows of the Act of August 24, 1912, for he wrote a letter to the *New York Times* about it, but he makes no mention of it in his book.

In his discussion of the Fifth Amendment, Mr. Taylor takes the currently fashionable position that the ordinary public may not draw an adverse inference when a witness invokes it. But Mr. Taylor knows that Professor Wigmore, the country's greatest authority on the law of Evidence, has asserted that it is "impossible to deny that the very claim of the privilege (against self-incrimination) involves a confession of the fact." He gives a footnote reference to this passage from Wigmore, but does not quote it, or any of the numerous court cases to the same effect. Nor does he mention that when the shoe was on the other foot, the liberals drew the most highly adverse inference from the failure to answer frankly the questions of Congressional examiners.

Mr. Taylor goes into great detail about the first Congressional investigation — which was into the failure of the expedition of General St. Clair into the Northwest Territory in 1791. General St. Clair was tortured with gout; he had three horses shot from under him; the attacking Indians probably excelled any other group in discipline and leadership, etc., etc. It seems too bad that Mr. Taylor did not go into equal detail with respect to those investigations in the 1920's and 1930's, which he and his associates so heartily approved, and which resemble so closely those investigations he now so roundly condemns.

When all is said and done, however, it is impossible not to be impressed by the agility and nimbleness with which Mr. Taylor capitalizes on fashion among the intelligentsia towards Congressional investigations, whatever that fashion may be. When they were fashionable, there he was, right on board, making a career out of them. Now that they are unfashionable, there he is again, right on board, making a career out of denouncing them. It's a neat trick if you can work it.

Letter from J. HOWARD PEW, industrialist: "May I take this opportunity of saying to you that HUMAN EVENTS is one of the few publications in this Country which are dedicated to truth. It is a digest of the most important happenings in America, and expressed so clearly and succinctly, that I derive real pleasure and satisfaction from the reading of it."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 15 HUMAN EVENTS April 9, 1955

Article Section

THE MATUSOW AFFAIR

By EUGENE LYONS

THE SQUALID HARVEY MATUSOW AFFAIR reflects no glory upon any of those who have used him in his various incarnations, least of all those who are using him now. Certainly the FBI and legislative committees showed bad judgment in accepting him as a sincere ex-comrade. But the Communists and a contingent of non-Communists are using the pathetic creature today, *after* his moral dizziness, exhibitionism and propensities for lying are plainly in evidence.

That certain self-styled liberals, not to mention official Communists, are exploiting the episode with a great avidity in a campaign to discredit all reformed Communists who are fighting Communism is, of course, understandable. They were engaged in that enterprise long before Matusow returned to their fold.

What surpasses understanding is that so many ostensibly conservative, anti-Communist papers and persons seem almost as gleeful as the *Daily Worker* itself over the business, and almost as intent upon besmirching and destroying the credibility of all ex-Communists. Rarely has the technique of imputing guilt by association (a shabby device no matter who employs it) been carried to such fantastic lengths, in this extraordinary campaign.

The chief victims of Matusow are not the people against whom he testified, as he now claims, falsely. In no instance, not even in the trial of Clinton Jencks in Texas, was his testimony decisive. In the New York trial of Communist Party leaders and other cases his contribution was negligible or superfluous. No, the main victims are the honest ex-Communists and repentant fellow-travellers whose sincerity is being deliberately impugned on Matusow's account.

In justice to them, and to the job of neutralizing the Red conspiracy, it is therefore important first of all to establish the fact that this Matusow is wholly *un-typical* of the ex-Communist. He seems, indeed, to sum up in his person all the things which the foremost ex-Communists, those who have been conspicuous and successful in exposing their abandoned creed, are not.

On the two or three occasions when I met Matusow during his career as an "ex," I was struck by his curious disinterest in Communism or, for that matter, political events and ideas of any kind. He was bursting with parlor tricks, jokes, comic ditties, gossip and above all, his current plans for crashing show business or getting rich on inventions.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When conversation touched on impersonal political issues, he seemed stranded. He simply was not a serious man.

His confessional book sustains my impression. Some reviewers have noted in astonishment that it contains no basic discussion of Communism or fascism or political or moral problems. Apparently he moved into a political party, moved out of it, drifted back into its environs, as casually as if it were a neighborhood athletic club. His shifting allegiances had nothing to do with views, convictions, or even temporary political preferences, but only with his little private frustrations, greeds and hungers for attention. He is so little aware of this lack in himself that he doesn't even pretend to have deeply-experienced *opinions*.

To equate such a character with ex-Communists as a class is monumental nonsense. Think of Whittaker Chambers, Elizabeth Bentley, Benjamin Gitlow, Louis Budenz, Bella Dodd, Max Eastman, Bertram D. Wolfe, Ben Mandel — to mention at random a very few whose testimony and writings have helped educate and alert the country on Communism. What such people have in common is the intensity of their political convictions, an almost obsessive interest in Communism, the involvement of their social conscience, the earnestness of their commitments. But these are precisely the traits which are not merely absent in Matusow but incompatible with his limited and self-centered mental and moral equipment.

The hostile judgments on ex-Communists as such which are being made on the basis of the Matusow case are therefore wholly irrelevant. Those who make them are either cynical, purposely misleading their readers and listeners, or too far gone in amorphous resentment of ex-Communists to be accessible to logic.

ACCORDING TO THE MYTH manufactured by anti-anti-Communists — the Alsop brother team, for instance — every Communist, upon breaking with the Party, rushes eagerly to tell all he knows and some extra. He becomes an "informer," a "paid informer," a "professional informer" (such are the widely disseminated opprobrious terms used), to rake in the rewards in cash and fame awaiting his kind.

This picture is false to the point of being grotesque. Actually all the temptations and pressures, for the disillusioned Communist, are on the side of silence and concealment. The membership turnover in the Communist Party is so great — 50 percent a year, some estimate — that by this time there must be hundreds of thousands of ex-Communists in America, and among them at least thousands who possess useful information. Yet only a handful, a few score perhaps, have dared to volunteer testimony.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This step, we know from the more articulate among them, is rarely taken lightly. It involves an agonizing struggle between public duty and private prudence, a painful reappraisal of conflicting loyalties and moral imperatives. The break with Communism does not come in a sudden flash — it's a slow convalescence, an aching journey from faith to doubt to new certainty.

The course of convenience is to slink away and try to forget; or at worst, if dredged up by some investigative body, to seek shelter under the Fifth Amendment. Even Whittaker Chambers, let it be remembered, said nothing until compelled by his conscience to speak up in a national emergency.

Allowing for a few exceptions, it is only the most honest and public-spirited ex-Communists, driven by a sense of guilt or a sense of patriotic obligation, who choose to cooperate with the authorities or to expose the Red menace by writing books and articles. They know that in openly working against the evil with which they once collaborated they make themselves targets for obscene abuse by former comrades and the vast Communist periphery. Having watched the process from the inside, they have no illusions about the extraordinary power of the "liberal" anti-anti-Communist forces to smear them, ostracize them and even to interfere with their livelihoods.

The violence of Communist and crypto-Communist attacks on what they call "renegades," "turncoats," "stool-pigeons" is not simply an expression of righteous anger. It has an important tactical purpose: to intimidate the more thin-skinned of the defectors, to convince them that they can buy immunity from the Party's expert mudgunners only by keeping their mouths firmly buttoned up.

Increasingly in recent years that obvious Red tactic has been adopted, in defiance of all common sense, by quite respectable newspapers, columnists, commentators. Their reckless use of epithets like "paid informer" suggests that it is somehow unsporting and vicious for a repentent Communist to dedicate himself to repairing the damage he has done. However high-minded their motives, they provide strong and often decisive reinforcement for Kremlin policies vis-a-vis knowledgeable fugitives from the Party's mental and moral stockades.

The *Christian Science Monitor* has long enjoyed a good reputation for a high standard of journalism. That paper surely would not knowingly deter a former Soviet spy from cooperating with the Government in exposing subversion. Yet it wrote not long ago: "It has been something of a shock to the American public to learn how many of these professional informers the Justice Department has been keeping on the string ready to testify against those charged with Communist affiliations."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I doubt that the public has been "shocked." My guess is that the normal American is pleased and comforted to learn that disenchanted comrades have put their inside knowledge about Red shenanigans at the disposal of the Justice Department. He is fully aware that our success in uncovering and identifying Soviet agents and false-fronts, such as it has been, would have been impossible without the devoted help of ex-Communists.

What do the *Christian Science Monitor,* the *New York Times,* the *Washington Post,* the excited Alsops and the others who smear informants in this area as "informers" really want? Would they be happier if the several score "exes" whom they systematically deride had, like the overwhelming majority of the species, retreated into silence and anonymity? Would not their professed zeal for public morality find more logical and more useful expression if they appealed to *all* former Communists to come forth and do battle against the gods that failed?

For 30 years now ex-Communists have been giving "witness," in the Chambers sense — not only in courts and committee rooms but in books. To those who have testified under oath we must add others, here and abroad, who have done so by the written word: people like Max Eastman, Ignazio Silone, Ruth Fischer, Arthur Koestler, Victor Kravchenko, Boris Souvarine, Andre Gide, etc. Taken together, these "informers" have not merely identified dangerous organizations, individuals, party lines, but with distinguished literary skill have taught the world most of what it now knows about the Kremlin's nature and purposes.

The remarkable fact is that there have been only three or four Matusows in the lot. If anything, the Matusow affair throws into bold relief the magnificent record of veracity and selfless devotion to duty of those ex-Communists who have sought courageously to atone for error by deeds of restitution. Their testimony has stood the test of time and events.

The Communist campaign to discredit such people, in which so many non-Communists are taking the lead, denies the total experience of man through the ages, which has recognized the validity of sincere repentance and invested it with the colors of special moral value. But even on the mundane level of expediency in this time of danger and challenge, we need the cooperation of former Communists. Our policy, individually and as a government, should be to encourage defection from the Kremlin's ranks — and then to encourage the defectors to tell all they know. The risk of an occasional liar and psychopath among them recommends caution but should not rule out common sense.

EUGENE LYONS is the author of *The Red Decade* and other books on Communism. Former editor of the *American Mercury,* he is at present a senior editor of the *Reader's Digest.* He has previously contributed to HUMAN EVENTS (Volume VIII, No. 13 "The Russians — And Their Friends," and Volume XI, No. 43, "Suicide of the Rich.")

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED